



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,562	06/30/2003	Mary Elizabeth Lawson	23952-0142	7254
72386 7590 01/29/2009				
SUTHERLAND II				
SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN, LLC				
999 PEACHTREE STREET				
ATLANTA, GA 30309				
EXAMINER				
KIM, STEVEN S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3685				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/29/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/608,562

Applicant(s)

LAWSON ET AL.

Examiner

STEVEN KIM

Art Unit

3685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/22/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15-19, 23, 24, 26, 28 and 30-44 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15-19, 23, 24, 26, 28 and 30-44 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/7/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is Final office action is in response to the amendment dated July 7, 2008.

Claim(s) Status

2. Claims 5-7, 10, 12, 14, 20-22, 25, 27 and 29 haven been cancelled.
3. Claims 30-44 have been newly added.
4. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, 13, 15-19, 23-24, 26 and 28 have been amended.
5. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, 13, 15-19, 23-24, 26, 28 and 30-44 are pending.

IDS Acknowledgement

6. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7/7/2008 was filed after the mailing date of the Non-Final Office action dated 4/4/2008. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on July 7, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Referring to the previous Office action, Examiner has cited relevant portions of the references as a means to illustrate the systems as taught by the prior art. As a means of providing further clarification as to what is taught by the references used in the first Office action, Examiner has expanded the teachings for comprehensibility while maintaining the same grounds of rejection of the claims, except as noted above in the section labeled "Status of Claims." This information is intended to assist in illuminating the teachings of the references while providing evidence that establishes further support for the rejections of the claims.

9. The Applicant contends that Cataline does not teach or suggest "determining a period time ... to complete a future payment to the payee issued on behalf of a payor" (see page 14 of the 07/07/08 Amendment). Cataline discloses determining a period of time to complete a future payment to the payee issued on behalf of a payor (see ¶0027, "optimize the timing" of various payment; ¶0051, payment schedule to avoid a late fee; ¶0055, optimization including lead time; ¶0076, payment optimizer that determines the settling of the payment including timing necessary for the particular situation).

10. The Applicant also contends that Cataline does not teach or suggest a method or system determining a period of time based on past issue information for the payee. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

11. Basch discloses a system and method comprising a communication interface configured to receive post-issue event information associated with each of the one or more payments (see Fig. 1, "Historical / Current Clearing and Settlement Transaction"), and Rehkopf teaches determining a period of time, i.e. optimization based on historical data related to time (see column 8 line 16 – column 9 line 8, measures the average elapse time to complete transaction and optimizes by determining which variable setting produces the best result).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings, predictable modeling using various mathematical techniques based on historical transaction information, of Basch as described above and Rehkopf disclosure, optimizing the performance of a system by determining which variable setting produces the best results, to the teachings of Cataline.

13. One of the ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the references in order to maximize payor's cash flow and reduce transactional cost (see ¶0033 in Cataline, "maintaining funds availability for the longest possible time").

14. The Applicant also contends that Rehkoph is generally relating to benchmarking and optimizing end-to-end processing performance of a computer network and that Rehkoph does not disclose or suggest "determining a period time, based upon the stored information and the post-issue event information, to complete a future payment

to the payee issued on behalf of a payor". In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Cataline discloses method of determining a period time based upon the stored information to complete a future payment to the payee issued on behalf of a payor (see ¶0027, "optimize the timing" of various payment; ¶0051, payment schedule; ¶0055, lead time; ¶0076, "what is the timing necessary for the particular situation"). While Basch discloses a system and method comprising a communication interface configured to receive post-issue event information associated with each of the one or more payments (see Fig. 1, "Historical / Current Clearing and Settlement Transaction"), and Rehkopf teaches determining a period of time, i.e. optimization based on historical data related to time (see column 8 line 16 – column 9 line 8, measures the average elapse time to complete transaction and optimizes by determining which variable setting produces the best result). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings as both prior art relate to optimization, specifically relating to determining optimal time.

15. The Applicant contends that Basch does not teach or suggest the amended language "receiving post-issue event information associated with each of the one or more payments". On the contrary, Basch discloses a method and system for receiving post-issue event information associated with each of the one or payments (see col. 11,

lines 7-65, collection of scorable transactions including transactional data further including clearings and settlements and the like).

16. Furthermore, the Applicant contends that combination of Basch and Cataline is improper since they are non-analogous fields. The Examiner disagrees. The prior art are related to financial process, specifically financial transaction, and hence are analogous fields.

17. In light of above, the Examiner maintains the rejections.

18. The newly added/amended claims are addressed below.

Claim Interpretation

19. In determining patentability of an invention over the prior art, all claim limitations have been considered and interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. See MPEP § 2111.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In *re Pruter*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969). See MPEP § 2111.

20. All claim limitations have been considered. Additionally, all words in the claims have been considered in judging the patentability of the claims against the prior art. See MPEP 2106 II C. The following language is interpreted as not further limiting the scope of the claimed invention. See MPEP 2106 II C.

Language in a method claim that states only the intended use or intended result but the expression does not result in a manipulative difference in the steps of the claim. Language in a system claim that states only the intended use or intended result, but does not result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art. In other words, if the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then the prior art meets the claim.

Claim limitations that contain statement(s) such as "if, may, might, can could", as optional language. As matter of linguistic precision, optional claim elements do not narrow claim limitations, since they can always be omitted.

Claim limitations that contain statement(s) such as "wherein, whereby", that fail to further define the steps or acts to be performed in method claims or the discrete physical structure required of system claims.

USPTO personnel should begin claim analysis by identifying and evaluating each claim limitation. For processes, the claim limitations will define steps or acts to be performed. For products, the claim limitations will define discrete physical structures or materials. Product claims are claims that are directed to either machines, manufactures or compositions of matter. See MPEP § 2106 II C.

The subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The following are examples of language that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim:

- (A) statements of intended use or field of use,
- (B) "adapted to" or "adapted for" clauses,
- (C) "wherein" clauses, or
- (D) "whereby" clauses.

See MPEP § 2106 II C.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

21. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

22. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant uses “means for” in claim 44 but does not include apparatus to the recited functional description(s). Moreover, the Applicant discloses the invention as computer software (see Specification ¶¶0112). Software or program per se is a non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

23. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

24. Claims 35, 36 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims recite “partial payment information” which was not described in the specification at the time the application was filed.

25. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

26. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, 13, 15-19, 23-24, 26, 28 and 30-44 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language, e.g. claim(s) that are directed towards apparatus are replete with functional language (see claim interpretation supra). The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device.

The claim(s) contain indefinite language. Examples includes nested "at least" in claim 8 and claim 23, "adjusting the average period is based at least partially..." in claim 31, "in accordance with the first payment option is based" in claim 42, and indefinite if clauses in claim 24.

Claim 1 recites "determining a period of time, based upon the stored information and post-issue event information", but claim 11, which depends on claim 1, recites "the period of time ... is determined based at least partially upon the stored information and the post-issue information." The use of "at least partially" in claim 11 renders the stored information or the post-information to be optional. This contradicts claim 1.

Claim 43 recites "wherein the payment option information transmitted via the user interface to the payor associated with at least one payment option identifies a cost to the payor associated with issuing payment in accordance with the at least one payment

option". It is unclear what is associated with at least one payment option and what is associated with issuing payment.

Claim 8 recites determining that a number of payments for which the post-issue event information includes posting information. However, claim 4, on which claim 8 depends, makes the posting information optional.

The claim(s) omits essential steps. For example, claim 31 recites "predetermined depositing/settlement adjustment period", but the claim omits the step of determining the adjustment period. Claim 11 recites "determined form of payment", but the claim omits the step of determining form of payment.

Claim 15 is a hybrid claim. The claim is directed toward method, however, it depends on claim 38 which is an apparatus claim.

The claim(s) contain limitations that lack antecedent basis. For example, claim 11 recites "the determined form of payment". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Aforementioned are few examples noted by the Examiner and do not represent a comprehensive list. The Applicant is advised to review the claim(s) in its entirety for correction(s).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

27. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

28. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, 13, 15-19, 23-24, 26, 28 and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application No. 2003/0055783, hereinafter referred to as "Cataline", and US Patent No. 6,658,393, hereinafter referred to as "Basch", further in view of US Patent No. 6,505,249, hereinafter referred to as "Rehkopf".

29. With respect to claim 1, 16 and 44, Cataline discloses a system and method comprising:

- storing information identifying a payment issue time of each of one or more payments to a payee (see Fig. 1, Data Storage 114; ¶0048 "transaction logs" stored on the Data Storage) and
- determining a period of time to complete a future payment to the payee issued on behalf of a payor (see ¶0027, "optimize the timing" of various payment; ¶0051, payment schedule; ¶0055, lead time; ¶0076, "what is the timing necessary for the particular situation").

30. In respect to claims 2 and 17, Cataline also discloses a system and method wherein a determination is based on priority level (see ¶0141, algorithm assigns "various weighting" and this weighting is then used as a "factor" in determining the most effective settlement mechanism) as indicated in claims 2 and 17.

31. In reference to claims 11 and 26, Cataline further disclose a system and method of determining a form of payment (see Fig. 4, Determine Optimal Funding Mechanism 414; ¶0034, effectuate the most optimal available transfer) and identifying at least one of the one or more payments having the determined form of payment (see Fig. 4, Determine Optimal Funding Mechanism 414; ¶0034, effectuate the most optimal available transfer); wherein the period of time to complete a future payment to the payee is determined based at least partially upon the stored information associated with the identified payments having the determined form of payment (see ¶0140, "time to complete settlement of a particular settlement mechanism" contained in a datastore).
32. As per claims 13 and 28, Cataline further discloses a system and method of receiving a payment request to pay the payee on behalf of the payor (see Fig. 4, Receive Payment Request 402), the payment request including information identifying a payment due date (see ¶0051, payment initiator designating a bill to be paid on the due date); determining a time to issue a payment to the payee to fulfill the payment request by the due date based at least partially upon the determined period of time to complete a future payment to the payee (see ¶0140, time to complete settlement); and issuing a payment to the payee at the determined time (see Fig. 2, Process Transfer, Confirm Delivery of Funds 232).
33. Cataline does not explicitly disclose a method of receiving post-issue event information associated with each of the one or more payments. While Cataline discloses determining an optimal period of time to issue the payment (see ¶0027, "optimize the timing" to effect various payments"), it does not specifically disclose the

method of determining the period of time based upon the stored information and the received post-issue event information.

34. Basch, however, discloses a system and method comprising a communication interface configured to receive post-issue event information associated with each of the one or more payments (see Fig. 1, "Historical / Current Clearing and Settlement Transaction"), and Rehkopf teaches determining a period of time, based upon the stored information and the received post-issue event information (see column 8 line 16 – column 9 line 8, measures the average elapse time to complete transaction and optimizes by determining which variable setting produces the best result), to complete a future payment to the payee issued on behalf of a payor (see column 9 line 5, "Bill Computation").

35. As per claims 3 and 18, Basch discloses a system and method wherein the determination is performed based on a number of instances greater than an associated threshold number (see column 11, lines 34-46, data collection activities include activities and data manipulations such as "data sampling", selection of samples, filtering, matching, and transformation).

36. As per claims 4 and 19, Basch also discloses wherein the post-issue event information includes at least one of i) posting information identifying a time that the payee posts the payment, ii) information identifying a time that the payee deposits a payment instrument associated with the payment at a financial institution, and iii) information identifying a time that a financial institution that maintains a deposit account

upon which a debit associated with the payment is drawn settles the debit (see Fig. 1, "Historical / Current Clearing and Settlement Transaction; see column 8, lines 34-39, historical and current clearing and settlement transaction received periodically).

37. Moreover, Basch discloses a system and method of predicting financial transactions based on historical transaction information sampling (see Abstract).

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings, predictable modeling using various mathematical techniques based on historical transaction information, of Basch as described above and Rehkopf disclosure, optimizing the performance of a system by determining which variable setting produces the best results, to the teachings of Cataline, optimization of payment methods including determining a period of time to complete a payment to a payee.

39. One of the ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the references in order to maximize payor's cash flow and reduce transactional cost (see ¶0033 in Cataline, "maintaining funds availability for the longest possible time"; ¶0027 in Cataline, "least cost") as well as in order to more efficiently process payment transactions.

40. Examiner further notes the term, "post-issue event information", is broad enough to read on current invoice which is the result of prior payment activities and current activity.

41. With respect to claims 8-9, 15, 23-24, 30-31, 38 and 39 the claims are directed to further methods and system that uses methods of algorithm to determine a period time to complete a payment based on sampling technique utilizing available historical transaction information. Basch discloses performing predictive modeling of financial transaction using different techniques, i.e. decision tee, linear regression, logistical regression, etc. (see column 11, lines 55-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use whatever mathematical algorithm the ordinary artisan feels will produce the best results (*Ex parte Smith*, 83 USPQ2d 1509 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 2007)).

42. As per claims 32 and 40, Cataline discloses a system and method comprising:
- transmitting a user interface presenting at least two payment options for paying the payee, wherein a first payment option of the at least two payment options includes information associated with the period of time to complete a future payment to the payee (see Cataline, ¶0045, user interface; Fig. 3, various drop down box for presenting payment options);
 - receiving a selection of a first payment option (see Cataline, ¶0045, user interface; Fig. 3, various drop down box for presenting payment options); and
 - issuing payment to the payee in accordance with the first payment option (see Cataline, ¶0045, user interface; Fig. 3, various drop down box for presenting payment options; ¶004 performing payment; Fig. 6, payment forwarding portion 520).

43. As per claim 33, Cataline further discloses wherein the first payment option comprises one of (i) an earliest available payment option or (ii) a future-dated payment option (see Fig. 3, payment date 308).

44. As per claim 34, Cataline discloses wherein the payee is an electronic managed payee and a second payment option of the at least two payment options comprises an immediate payment and posting option (see Cataline, ¶0053, various protocols used in transferring funds immediately; Fig. 3, Transfer to 306; Fig. 6).

45. As per claims 35, 36 and 41, Cataline discloses payment initiator used to manage payment of types of bill and other payment from diverse source of funds, including paper and electronic form (see ¶0029-0030).

46. As per claims 37 and 42, Cataline further discloses receiving one of (i) a process date or (ii) a due date, wherein issuing payment to the payee in accordance with the first payment option is based at least partially upon the process date or the due date (see Cataline, ¶0051, paying on the due date).

47. As per claim 43, the claim is directed to payment option information which is non-functional descriptive material. The structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific payment option information. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re

Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP ' 2106.

Conclusion

48. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

49. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Corrona et al., US Patent Application Np. 2002/0111916, discloses a system and method of effecting a payment from a payor in response to a payment request, further discloses a payment method recommendation that provide information about the payment method for the current transaction, including a

recommendation regarding the best available payment method and other payment methods that meet the user's payment rules;

- Johnson et al., US Patent No. 6,999,943, disclose a system and method for providing multiple payment method for cost/benefit analysis;
- Almalraj et al., US Patent Application No. 2004/0215560, disclose a system and method of integrated payment;
- Dent et al., US Patent No. 6,128,603, disclose a system and method for managing and paying electronic bills;
- Strutt et al, US Patent Application No. 2002/0133368, disclose a system and method for Accounts Payable;
- Kitchen et al., US Patent No. 7,120,602, disclose a method of electronic billing and payment.

50. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEVEN KIM whose telephone number is (571)270-5287. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:30AM - 5:00PM).

51. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin Hewitt can be reached on (571)272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

52. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 3685

/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685